

**THE JOURNALS OF  
THE REV. THOMAS MORRELL  
METHODIST PATRIOT  
AND PREACHER**

**1747 - 1838**

**THE MAVERICK STRAIN:  
DISSENT AND REFORM  
IN THE  
UNITED METHODIST TRADITION**

THE JOURNALS OF  
THE REV. THOMAS MORRELL

THE MAVERICK STRAIN:  
DISSENT AND REFORM  
IN THE  
UNITED METHODIST TRADITION

Michael J. McKay  
*Editor*

Publication  
of the  
Historical Society  
Northern New Jersey Conference  
The United Methodist Church  
Madison, NJ  
1984

## CONTENTS

Editor's Introduction .....	v
THE JOURNALS OF THE REV. THOMAS MORRELL	
Editor's Note .....	1
Biographical Data .....	2
Journal .....	9
Editor's Note .....	51
Notes .....	53
THE MAVERICK STRAIN: DISSENT AND REFORM IN THE UNITED METHODIST TRADITION	
Introduction .....	56
I. Founding Period .....	57
II. Middle Period .....	62
III. Modern Period .....	65
End Notes .....	66

Printed and bound in  
The United States of America  
by  
Academy Books  
Rutland, VT 05701-0757

THE MAVERICK STRAIN:  
DISSENT AND REFORM  
IN THE  
UNITED METHODIST TRADITION

Kenneth E. Rowe  
*Drew University*

*An address delivered April 28, 1982 at the annual meeting of the Commission on Archives and History of the Northeastern Jurisdiction of the United Methodist Church.*

When United Methodists gathered for their first general conference in 1972, they found themselves struggling to understand what it means to be a pluralistic as well as united church. The large number of persons wearing badges and buttons, handing out hastily-mimeographed newsletters, holding impromptu press conferences, buttonholing delegates startled many, including one bishop with whom I had breakfast in the middle of the first week of the conference. "Caucuses, quotas and politics—how very un-Methodist," said the bishop as we chatted about conference doings. The casual conversation that morning led me to a decade of reflection on the whole matter of dissent and reform in the United Methodist tradition. Caucuses, quotas and politics are neither new nor un-Methodist. Consensus historiography and a triumphalist count-the-converts approach to our heritage through the years has tended to hide this part of our tradition which I like to call the maverick strain.

Through the years United Methodism has been burdened and blessed by a succession of independent spirits, Methodist mavericks, squarepeg EUB. They have provided necessary vitality to balance connectional authority. The tension between independence and authority, however, led to much trouble and several schisms.

There is something of Wesley in the maverick strain. It was Wesley's own stubborn commitment to Christian principle which led him to tinker with the structures of the Church of England and fashion fresh new methods of evangelism and Christian nurture for the church in England. It was Wesley's own stubborn commitment to Christian principle which led him to the fateful decision to declare in 1784 an emergency and ordain preachers for America. Wesley was a nuisance to all bureaucrats, bishops and complacent institutionalists who valued structure over spirit, order over life, protocol over piety. Although by nature conservative and reluctant to change institutions, nevertheless with accelerating power, he changed inherited patterns of church life to fit the changing needs under the Gospel. This spirit of independence carried over into many of his spiritual children. However not all possessed as much of his discipline as they did of his independence.

There is something of Otterbein in the maverick strain. Like Wesley in England Otterbein felt compelled to tinker with the inherited patterns of church life of the German Reformed Church in the interest of renewed lives and renewed churches, first in Lancaster and then more fully in Baltimore. When, on the eve of the American Revolution, he became concerned about the churchless Germans in the rural areas of Pennsylvania and Maryland and began to travel out to preach to them, he got "in Dutch" with his ministerial colleagues. A few years later when Asbury pushed Methodist-style organization for the brethren who united around him, Otterbein balked. He preferred to allow the preachers and people as much individual prerogative as possible.

There is little of Asbury in the Maverick strain. Methodism's founding bishop may have looked like a maverick when he insisted on being elected bishop of his colleagues at the Christmas Conference despite the fact that Wesley named him to the post. But once in the office he quickly proceeded to fashion an imperial approach to episcopacy. Under his leadership the book of discipline rapidly expanded from a 35-page appendix to a much larger book (Mr. Wesley's prayer book) in 1784 to almost 250 pages in 1792, a gain of more than 200 pages of rules and regulations in eight short years. All of this legislation was vigorously enforced by Asbury with military precision. Once the rules were set into print and into motion, talk of reform was barely tolerated.

There is little of Albright here also. It was the rigor of their discipline, personal and churchly, which first attracted Albright to the Methodists following his conversion in 1791. Once underway, his movement underwent rapid institutionalization and by 1808 had adopted a German translation of the Methodist discipline only slightly altered. Evangelicals following Albright tended to be more rigid than their United Brethren cousins in matters of polity and less ready to make major changes.

With that much, I hope, as a tantalizing introduction, my paper unfolds under three headings: 1) The Founding Period: Mavericks Appear; 2) Middle Period: Mavericks Muzzles; 3) Modern Period: Mavericks Revive.

I. FOUNDING PERIOD: MAVERICKS APPEAR

The new churches in the new nation—Methodist, Evangelical and United Brethren—had no clearly defined nor well-established systems of governance. Two authority centers were emerging and competing for center stage—the bishop and the conference. The precise role of the bishops was not spelled out and their relationship to the conference of preachers was unclear. Were the bishops amenable to the conference of preachers or were they an equal and coordinate center of authority?

The preachers met annually in conference and, as the churches followed the frontier, those nearest the site of the conference predominated in decision-making. To respond to this situation, several conferences, not just one, were established until at any one time there were more than a half dozen regional (later annual) conferences held each year. Parliamentarily this meant that for

any action to be binding on the whole church, it had to be favorably passed by every regional conference. This concurrent conference plan was inconvenient to say the least. It was cumbersome, impractical, and threatened the unity of the churches. Yet this concurrent conference plan continued among the Methodists until 1792, until 1815 among the United Brethren, and until 1816 among the Evangelicals when a regular pattern of quadrennial general conferences was established.

This conflict between bishops and conferences was particularly intense among the Methodists. The matter came to a head in 1789 when Bishop Asbury proposed that a council of bishops and presiding elders handle all matters of doctrine and discipline for the whole church. The defects for freedom-loving American preachers were obvious. Since the presiding elders were appointed by Asbury, they were not representatives of the rank and file preacher. The composition and control of the proposed council would be solely in Asbury's hands. After much hew and cry Asbury bowed to pressure and agreed to call a general conference of preachers in the fall of 1792 to resolve the dilemma of who's in charge.

All of the traveling preachers were invited to attend and vote on all matters of doctrine and discipline. The architect of this new plan was not Asbury but James O'Kelly of Maverick fame.

In the years immediately following the Christmas Conference, James O'Kelly was one of Asbury's chief lieutenants in the southern states. Increasingly O'Kelly felt that unless the power of Asbury to manage the conferences and to station the preachers was curtailed, some of the best preachers would be lost. So he and other like-minded colleagues, especially in Virginia, argued for the right of clergy to appeal their appointment, for an elective versus an appointive presiding eldership to balance the power of the bishop, and for conference rights for "local" preachers and lay folk as well.

When the preachers gathered in Baltimore for Methodism's first conference in 1792, the O'Kelly forces and the Asbury forces were ready for a show-down fight. The O'Kelly forces won round one when Asbury's council plan was soundly defeated. But when O'Kelly's historic motion to ease the absolute appointive power of the bishop lost, the O'Kelly forces walked out and formed the Republican Methodist Church. No lone maverick, O'Kelly took with him a significant number of clergy and lay members, especially in Virginia and the Carolinas where O'Kelly was revered. A pamphlet war between the "Republican" and the "Episcopal" Methodists went on into the next century.

Five more general conferences were held between 1792 and 1808. But this plan of governance also had problems. From the preachers point of view conference membership was unequal and unfair, since preachers close to the conference predominated. From the bishop's point of view (i.e., Asbury) it was unsafe. The chief features of Methodist polity—episcopacy, itinerancy, appointive power, etc.—were all vulnerable. A simple majority vote at any one time could profoundly alter the governance pattern of the new church. There was, from Asbury's point of view, no safe power center.

By 1808 when the preachers gathered in Baltimore, the inoperability of the previous experiments in governance were obvious and forced the naming of the church's first structure study commission. A "committee of fourteen" was appointed on the first day to draft a "constitution" for the church. Their report, much debated but finally adopted, significantly affected the two principal authority centers in the church. For the first time there was a clear delineation of powers in a formal constitution. Bishops were to have presidential, executive and administrative duties; legislative powers were vested in a delegated quadrennial general conference. Most important of all for our study of the maverick strain, "Restrictive Rules" were added to safeguard the system.

In essence, Methodism's polity canon closed in 1808. Only two major changes were made to the church's basic constitution in the next century and a half—lay representation beginning in 1872 and jurisdictional conferences in 1939. A hefty book of discipline complete with a constitution protected by "restrictive rules" made it almost impossible to make any fundamental changes in the church's pattern of governance. The future of the maverick tradition seemed dim. But, as we shall see, almost as quickly as the conservatives adopted the constitution, mavericks rose up to challenge the system.

The development of authority centers proceeded much more slowly and along different lines among the United Brethren.<sup>1</sup> Although the final shape was similar to the Methodist plan—leadership by bishops and governance by conference—the spirit was different.

From the beginning of their friendship in 1774, Asbury and Otterbein agreed that evangelical conversion was the foundation for the church's mission, but disagreed on the nature and extent of discipline and organization. As rapid institutionalization occurred among the Methodists, the conflict only intensified. Asbury openly discussed the matter with Otterbein when he called on him in Baltimore in 1786. "We had some free conversation on the necessity of forming a church among the Dutch, holding conferences, the order of its government, etc.," Asbury wrote in his journal.<sup>2</sup> Not till three years later did Otterbein call the first meeting of the leaders of the German evangelical revival in the middle colonies (1789). A second meeting was not held until 1791.

Although minutes of these early meetings do not survive, there is no evidence that Otterbein and the German pastors took Asbury's advice. They made no move to form a new church among the "Pennsylvania Dutch." They preferred to remain a loose confederation of evangelical pastors from a variety of German-speaking denominations—Lutheran, Mennonite, Amish and Moravian, as well as German Reformed. Resident pastors "volunteered" as itinerants in their neighborhoods, quarterly meetings were held for preaching and celebration of the sacraments, occasional "big meetings" gathered folks from long distances for several days to hear a succession of preachers who stayed on for an extra day to talk shop. They respected each others' denominational affiliations and recognized each other's ordinations. Ability to preach and zeal for the evangelical revival were the primary qualifications for

admission to Otterbein's band. His personal guidance plus the church rules which he wrote for his Baltimore congregation in 1785 were apparently sufficient for these "united brethren."<sup>3</sup>

Not until September of 1800 did the German-speaking evangelical clergy begin to hold annual conferences to plan their work. The minutes of these and subsequent early "annual conferences" reveal a different approach to church governance than that which developed among the Methodists under Asbury. Two examples will make my point—guidelines for the deployment of clergy and for the formation of class meetings. The minutes of 1801 annual report suggest a "voluntary" itinerancy:

It was asked who are willing to take charge of a circuit and preach at the appointed places. Then the following preachers offered themselves.

Practice apparently varied. In the Pennsylvania conference several leading pastors were named to "place the preachers in order . . . as may tend most to the honor of God and the benefit of the hearers and the bettering of the Church of God." In Maryland the appointments were "left to the preachers themselves to arrange."<sup>4</sup> Class meetings too among the United Brethren were voluntary. The Methodist discipline required them; the United Brethren minutes simply said: "Our preachers are at liberty to keep class meetings . . . at any place they think proper or to be useful."<sup>5</sup> The norm in both cases among the United Brethren was to allow the preachers as much individual prerogative as possible and suggests a low profile (in governance at least) for their reverend fathers in God. Asbury's displeasure is apparent in a journal entry for 1803:

There are upwards of twenty German preachers somehow connected with Mr. Philip Otterbein and Martin Boehm; but they want authority, and the church wants discipline.<sup>6</sup>

In the years following, Otterbein was less active in the movement largely due to age (he was almost eighty) and declining health. One month before he died (July 1813) he ordained three preachers as elders, one of whom was Christian Newcomer, upon whom his mantle of leadership fell. By this act Otterbein insured the movement's survival, but still no plan of governance was established. Two years later (1815) at a general conference of preachers the church was more fully organized with two annual conferences, a confession of faith, a hymnbook and a simple discipline of six short paragraphs, a far cry from the two hundred plus page discipline the Methodists were using by that time.

The loosely organized United Brethren were gradually becoming more structured. Still, when compared to the authoritarian style of Asbury and his insistence on obedience to the bishops and their assistants, the presiding elders, the United Brethren structure of voluntary cooperation among equals of various church backgrounds centered in the conference of preachers and led by an episcopacy more honorific than administrative seemed loose and ungoverned.

Serious conversations between the United Brethren and the Methodists about a possible union took place during the years 1809-1814. Much correspondence passed between Asbury and Newcomer and conference secretaries. There were some agreements: mutual recognition of members at love feasts, class meetings and the Lord's Supper, free interchange of pulpits among licensed preachers of both churches. But Methodist leaders made it clear from the outset that union could not take place until the United Brethren adopted a formal discipline. Asbury had the Methodist discipline translated into German in the hopes that the United Brethren would adopt it or use it as a model. Published in Lancaster in the spring of 1808, it was ignored by the United Brethren who preferred a simpler set of rules and regulations for pastors and people. Newcomer put his finger on the crux of the matter in a letter to the Methodists in 1809, when he referred to the discipline as "some external church regulations."<sup>7</sup> Methodists of the Asbury variety saw discipline as essential; United Brethren saw discipline as cumbersome. Thus fundamentally different approach led to a breakdown of negotiations.

While talking with the Methodists the United Brethren were quietly putting into place their own distinctive pattern of governance. United Brethren bishops and later superintendents would be elected for terms rather than for life. Their annual conferences were made up mostly of local preachers who were equals in conference to the itinerants whereas Methodist conferences were made up solely of itinerant clergy and local preachers had no conference rights. United Brethren pastors had a large measure of discretion and authority in their work: the Methodist pastor's job description was precisely specified and carefully supervised. United Brethren local churches were given a large measure of control over their local affairs whereas Methodist layfolk were to pray, pay and obey. It was a loose connectionalism rather than the strict and tight connectionalism of the Methodists.

Asbury, in preaching the funeral sermon for Martin Boehm on April 23, 1812, pauses to reflect on this very point:

Why was the German reformation in the middle states, that sprang up with Boehm, Otterbein, and their helpers, not more perfect? . . . There was no master-spirit to rise up and organize and lead them. Some of the ministers located, and added to their charge partial travelling laborers; and all were independent. It remains to be proved whether a reformation, in any country, or under any circumstances, can be perpetuated without a well-directed itinerance.

Thus, language was not the principle barrier which kept United Brethren and Methodists apart in the founding era, but rather a fundamental difference in understanding church discipline and governance.

While Otterbein was gathering the wayward "Dutch" into a new fold that would soon become the United Brethren in Christ, Jacob Albright was still down on the farm making bricks and babies—both with the help of his good wife Catherine. Raised in the Lutheran Church, he learned Luther's Catechism and was received into membership but without a religious experience of his own. His conversion in 1791 following the tragic death of six of his children

within a month led him to look for a church in which he could nourish his faltering faith. Increasingly feeling the Lutheran Church to be too formal and too critical of his newly won evangelical fervor, he sought a warmer fellowship.

Albright found the Methodists to be serious-minded and well-disciplined, and soon made their church his spiritual home. His one handicap was language. He had taught himself English but it was his second language and he found it difficult to participate fully in the Methodist services which were all held in English. Further, he had a growing compassion for his unconverted German-speaking neighbors whom he saw as sheep without a shepherd. Then came a call to preach (1796). Brickmaking gradually gave way to convert-making on ever-expanding preaching tours throughout the heartland of Pennsylvania.

Formal organization of the so-called "Albright People" and preachers came quickly and in two stages. In 1803 his followers declared themselves as independent religious society and organized themselves around the Scriptures as the basic rule of faith and order. Four years later the conference resolved to meet annually and asked ailing Albright to prepare a book of discipline. Albright, who admired Methodism's discipline and Asbury's style, did not live to complete the task. His successor, George Miller, proposed to the 1808 annual conference the Asbury-sponsored German translation of the Methodist Discipline published in Lancaster earlier that year with minor adjustments. The conference adopted it and ordered its publication.

More like the Methodist than the United Brethren approach to governance, the new Evangelical discipline was mostly mandatory rather than permissive and left little room for local initiative. Although the discipline provided for a general conference and the office of bishop, a general conference was not called until 1816 and a new bishop was not elected until 1839. In the meantime a small cadre of presiding elders gave leadership and presided at conferences.

## II. MIDDLE PERIOD: MAVERICKS MUZZLED

By 1808 the Methodist and Evangelical movements, and to a less extent the United Brethren, had become establishments. Almost unconsciously our founding mothers and fathers had become more immobilist than progressive in temper and procedure. Throughout the middle period, which I am defining rather extensively 1808-1968, United Methodists tended to be heavy on discipline and harsh on dissenters. And this was justified by the stable conviction of the leaders of each of the churches that any change would be for the worse, since the system as it stood was so nearly perfect as to stand in no need of radical reformation.

Mavericks were not absent in this period, but they were muzzled, especially among the Methodists. In almost every decade between 1810 and the turn of the century Methodists had a full-blown church fight which led to schism. In contrast the United Brethren and the Evangelicals had only one major schism during the same years.

The decade of the 1810's saw the rise of independent black Methodist churches in Philadelphia (African Methodist Episcopal Church organized 1816) and in New York (African Methodist Episcopal Zion Church not fully organized until 1824). In each case polity issues were mixed with racial issues. Both the beginning and the end of the next decade—the 1820s—was marked by schism. William Stillwell led a congregationalist-oriented schism from New York Methodism in 1820. It was a relatively minor schism compared to the larger one that was brewing throughout the decade.

Asbury's death in 1816 may have signalled to Methodist mavericks that they might now get a better hearing. The next general conference (1820) met literally over Asbury's dead body. He was buried under the pulpit of Eutaw Street Methodist Episcopal Church, Baltimore, where the conference gathered that year. Mavericks rallied around three reform issues during that conference and kept them on the agendas of reform caucuses and conferences for the rest of the decade; an elective presiding eldership, conference rights for local preachers (who by the 1820s outnumbered itinerant elders three to one), and most explosive of all, lay representation in clergy-dominated conferences. The mavericks gained a momentary victory in 1820 when the conference voted in favor of electing presiding elders. However, when the propriety and constitutionality of the legislation was questioned by Bishop McKendree and Bishop-elect Soule, the conference declined to implement its new plan. The matter was reconsidered at the next general conference (1824) but the mavericks lost by a close vote. When the third general conference of the decade (1828) refused to admit the principle of lay representation or to reform the episcopal office, the mavericks withdrew in large numbers and formed the Methodist Protestant Church—with no bishops but conference presidents elected annually, appointment of pastors by a committee of clergy, and equal lay and clergy representation in the conferences.

During the decade of the 1830s, slavery and constitutional questions became intertwined in an increasingly bitter debate, which would erupt into schism twice in the next decade. Methodism's radical abolitionists exited to form the Wesleyan Methodist Church in 1842. Two years later a major expulsion occurred when Methodist north and south divided over the twin issues of slavery and episcopacy.

In the 1860s institutional criticism, the issue of slavery on the eve of the war and debate over the Wesleyan doctrine of perfect love, conspired to raise another church fight. By 1860 the charismatic leader of the expelled mavericks, Benjamin T. Roberts, formed the Free Methodist Church proclaiming freedom for blacks and freedom from bishops. In the next decade (1870s) newly freed blacks in the south were organized by their white patrons into an independent Colored (later Christian) Methodist Episcopal Church. Following a decade of debate over the proper interpretation of the Wesleyan doctrine of perfect love, holiness advocates went out in the 1890s to form the Church of the Nazarene and a whole family of holiness churches. As the twentieth century dawned, American Methodism was in the midst of an orgy of sectarian diversification.

It was only in the latter years of the 19th century that United Brethren and Evangelicals experienced wrenching schisms. United Brethren mavericks, who had been pressing their church to update its doctrinal standards and overhaul its discipline, successfully promoted a whole new constitution for the church plus a fresh new confession of faith at the general conference of 1889. A small minority who refused to accept the changes withdrew to form the United Brethren in Christ (Old Constitution). This is the only instance I know of where the renewalists outnumbered and outvoted the immobilists.

A decade later in the 1890s the Evangelicals experienced their one and only major schism. A bitter battle raged between the eastern-based progressive minority who favored English, a curtailed episcopacy, and were open to new theological developments and the Indianapolis-based majority who favored German language, strong bishops, and a conservative theological stance. For a quadrennium, until the courts settled the matter, there were two Evangelical Associations each claiming to be the whole. In 1894, however, the renewalist minority organized the United Evangelical Church, while the conservative majority continued as the Evangelical Association.

Two observations by way of conclusion. First, with but one exception, all of our schisms (Methodist, Evangelical and United Brethren) were largely polity disputes. Matters of discipline were always of decisive importance in these church fights. Second, in all but the United Brethren tradition, conservatives succeeded in muzzling the mavericks. What is unique about the United Brethren schism of 1889 is that the reformers were the majority and it was the conservatives who withdrew. Unlike their Methodist and Evangelical cousins, the United Brethren used their conference process well to maintain an ongoing, updated consensus on matters of doctrine and polity.

If the nineteenth century was marked by schism because there were no reform, the twentieth century was marked by reunions without reform. 1922, 1939, 1946 and 1968—these beginnings, inspiring as they were, appear to be in retrospect more grand pageants marking the merger of similar bodies than the creation of something distinctively new. What differences there were between the parties were always resolved in favor of the traditional pattern. All of the older Evangelical principles were continued in 1922 when dissident United Evangelicals merged with the Evangelical Association. In 1939 the Methodist Protestants gave up dearly held and hard won principles of term episcopacy and appointment of pastors by committee. In 1946 the United Brethren quietly gave up the practice of ordaining women at the insistence of the Evangelicals. In 1968 the Evangelical and United Brethren pattern of term episcopacy and an elected district superintendency, long advocated by Methodist mavericks, were given up under pressure from Methodist conservatives.

In each "union" mavericks continued to be muzzled and no strenuous adjustments were necessary. The structures simply were skillfully and securely stitched together. These weddings were rather like the remarriage of two middle aged old pros—relatively painless, little change in lifestyle for either party, few new commitments.

### III. MODERN PERIOD: MAVERICKS REVIVED

The turbulent 1960s marked the coming of age of United Methodism's growing family of renewal groups—the ethnic caucuses (Asian, Blacks, Hispanics, and Native Americans) along with women, youth, seminarians, and gays. The sixty-year old Methodist Federation for Social Action on the left had been joined by the youthful Good News Movement on the right. The time had come, each said in its own way, to redress the balance and rediscover the rich diversity of the Methodist family. The Maverick spirit, muzzled for more than a century, was beginning to bubble up all across the church.

The ruling principle of the commission that worked out the 1968 merge was unite now, settle the differences later. Issues such as ministry and episcopacy, doctrinal standards and social principles, the number of seminaries and an unbelievably complicated cluster of national program boards, had to be addressed. The uniting conference wisely established a pattern of church-wide quadrennial study commissions to tackle them one by one. Atlanta 1972 was a major turning point inaugurating a new era and a rediscovery of the spirit of United Methodist polity.

The United Methodist Church in its first general conference discovered a new identity as it chose its own distinctive life-style for the years ahead. You remember some of the goodies that came out of Atlanta 1972—a new statement of doctrine and doctrinal standards (largely ignored); a major restructuring of the general boards and agencies (more a reshuffling of units into four super boards than any paring down of Methodism's "Vatican"). Still there were pluses.

A renewed United Methodist Church emerged in 1972. The General Council on Ministries found its niche in evaluation and coordination, the General Council on Finance and Administration showed that savings can be effected and control exercised by central fiscal management; the quota system for electing members created new, uncertain boards, but youth, women and minority representatives gained articulation and white, male, middle-ages clergy learned the consequences of sharing power. Newly created and fully funded commissions on Religion and Race and Status and Role of Women, indicated the church was serious about combating racism and sexism. Required consultation in the appointive process was written into the Book of Discipline. Even a General Commission on Archives and History found it way into the discipline and into the budget.

In spite of bishops and bureaucrats, parliamentary maneuvers and merger "mafias," the maverick strain found its way into the heart of the United Methodist tradition and there is every evidence that it is still with us. Every generation has had its independent characters and caucuses, who would not be put down either by episcopal authority or by majority vote. Many of the issues they championed required an extended campaign before the church bowed to reform. The fact that occasionally such conduct has smacked more of the eccentric than the responsible, does not obscure the importance of the maverick strain in United Methodism.



We remain true to the founding spirit of United Methodist polity when we subject every institution of the church—our administrative boards, our conferences, our bishops and superintendents, our general boards and agencies, even our seminaries—to the test of mission and service. How well do they enable us and our neighbors to experience the love of God in Christ? A valid revival of the spirit of United Methodist polity must also include the built-in provision for change and adaptation which is also a part of that heritage. A place must be made for the creative maverick—unbranded, unowned, and free. The future of the church depends not so much on how we may tinker with our ecclesiastical machinery, as it does with the depth of our Christian commitment, the extent of our concern for genuine reform and renewal, and our openness to the winds of God's spirit, which are pressing us to abandon our defensiveness and to move with hope toward new and richer ministries in our time and for our future.

#### ENDNOTES

1. For my discussion of the Evangelical United Brethren tradition, I have used J. Bruce Behney and Paul H. Eller, *The History of the Evangelical United Brethren Church*, Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1979 and Jeffrey P. Mickel, "A Comparison of the Doctrines of Ministry of Francis Asbury and Philip William Otterbein," *Methodist History*, vol. 19, no. 4 (July 1981) pp. 187-205.
2. *Journal and Letters of Francis Asbury*, edited by Elmer T. Clark, Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1959, vol. I, p. 513.
3. Mickel, op. cit., pp. 192-193.
4. "Minutes of the United Brethren in Christ" in Arthur C. Core, editor, *Philip William Otterbein; Pastor, Ecumenist*. Dayton, Ohio: Board of Publication of the Evangelical United Brethren Church, 1968, pp. 122, 123.
5. Quoted in Mickel, op. cit., p. 196.
6. Asbury, *Journal*, vol. II, p. 400. Emphasis mine.
7. Quoted in Mickel, op. cit., p. 196.
8. Quoted in Francis Hollingsworth, "Notices of the Life and Labours of Martin Boehm and William Otterbein," *Methodist Magazine*, vol. 6 (July 1823) p. 253.